

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

---

<b>THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE</b>	:	
<b>FOR GREATER PHILADELPHIA,</b>	:	
<b>Individually and on behalf of its members,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	<b>No. 17-1548</b>
	:	
<b>CITY OF PHILADELPHIA and</b>	:	
<b>PHILADELPHIA COMMISSION ON</b>	:	
<b>HUMAN RELATIONS,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants.</b>	:	
	:	

---

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2017, upon consideration of “Plaintiff’s Motion for a Preliminary Injunction” (Doc .No. 32), the Response in opposition (Doc. No. 63), the Reply in support (Doc. No. 79), and the Sur-Reply in opposition (Doc. No. 81), it is hereby **ORDERED** that oral argument shall be held on **Monday, January 8, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.**, in Courtroom 4-B. The parties shall be prepared to address the following questions:

1. Is a hearing on the Chamber’s Motion for a Preliminary Injunction necessary?
2. Assuming the Court determines that a hearing is necessary, (1) what evidence/witnesses does the City wish to present to establish that the Ordinance at issue directly advances a substantial governmental interest; and (2) is this evidence pre- or post-enactment evidence, and are both types of evidence admissible?
3. Again, assuming a hearing is ordered, what, if any, evidence/witnesses will the Chamber wish to present either in response to the City’s evidence or to support its motion?

4. What, if any, (limited) discovery is needed for the hearing?
5. Assuming a hearing will be held, will either party seek to introduce evidence on whether the Ordinance is not more extensive than is necessary to further the City's interest?
6. If a hearing is held, what, if any, evidence does either party intend to present regarding irreparable harm?

**BY THE COURT:**

**/s/ Mitchell S. Goldberg**

**Mitchell S. Goldberg, J.**